



Massachusetts

Department of Correction

Quarterly Report on the Status of Prison Overcrowding, First Quarter of 1998

**Submitted in Compliance with Chapter 799
Section 21 of the Acts of 1985**

Michael T. Maloney
Commissioner

June, 1998

Approved by: State Purchasing Agent
Publication No: 14,602-09-45-10-10-86

1998 First Quarter Report

Section Twenty-one of Chapter 799 of the Acts of 1985 directs the Commissioner of Correction to report quarterly on the status of overcrowding in state and county facilities. This statute calls for the following information:

Such report shall include, by facility, the average daily census for the period of the report and the actual census on the first and the last days of the report period.

Said report shall also contain such information for the previous twelve months and a comparison to the rated capacity of such facility.

This report presents the required statistics for the first quarter of 1998.

This report was prepared by Hollie Matthews of Research and Planning, and is based on daily count sheets prepared by the Classification Division.

1998 First Quarter Report

Contents

Technical Notes	1
Abbreviations	2
Table 1. Population in Department of Correction Facilities, January 2, 1998 to March 31, 1998	3
Table 2. Population in Department of Correction Facilities, January 2, 1997 to December 31, 1997	4
Table 3. Population in County Correctional Facilities, January 2, 1998 to March 31, 1998	5
Table 4. Population in County Correctional Facilities, January 2, 1997 to December 31, 1997	5
Figure 1. DOC Sentenced Population, First Quarter of 1997 and 1998	6
Figure 2. HOC Population, First Quarter of 1997 and 1998	6
Table 5. Court Commitments by Gender, 1997 and 1998	7
Figure 3. Court Commitments by Gender, 1997 and 1998	7

Technical Notes

- The official capacity or custody level designation for each facility can change for a number of reasons, e.g. expansion of facility beds, decrease of facility beds due to fire, or changes in contracts with vendors. In all tables the capacity and custody level reflects the status at the end of the reporting period. The design capacity is reported for correctional facilities in Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4.
- On November 15, 1996, one hundred new modular beds were added to MCI Concord, increasing its design capacity to 614. Ninety-six modular beds were also added to MCI Norfolk, increasing its total to 1,084 beds. Pondville Correctional Center was reclassified from Custody Level 3/2 to Custody Level 3.
- Two hundred forty-three new modular beds were added to Middlesex (Billerica) House of Correction during November 15, 1996, increasing its total to 1,035 beds.
- Due to changes in the Massachusetts General Law, DOC consolidated one unit at the Bridgewater Treatment Center and back-filled with general population inmates. These design capacity beds were placed on-line November 8, 1996 and first appeared on the November 12, 1996 daily count sheet. Three hundred additional beds were placed on-line during the third quarter of 1997.
- Due to the Department's policy changes, the security level of MCI-Shirley (Min) was changed from Security Level 3/2 to Security Level 3 during the first quarter of 1996 .
- On January 31, 1995, the design capacity for the Departmental Segregation Units (DSU) at MCI-Cedar Junction and MCI-Norfolk were taken off the count sheets. The segregation units are considered support beds and are not shown on the daily count sheet as design capacity. This resulted in the elimination of 91 beds (60 at Cedar Junction and 31 at Norfolk) from the previous quarterly reports.
- In previous quarterly reports, the population figures for PPREP were included with the Park Drive population. The PPREP population is reported independently starting with the first quarter of 1995.
- Where relevant, the population figures for all facilities include both male and female inmates except as shown at Lancaster.
- State inmates housed in the Hampshire County Contract Program are included in the county population tables, as are all other state inmates housed in county facilities.
- Longwood Treatment Center is a specialized DOC facility for individuals incarcerated for O.U.I. Because the inmates are primarily county sentenced inmates, the inmate count and bed capacity are also included in Tables 3 and 4.
- The Massachusetts Boot Camp opened on August 17, 1992, and is located at the Bridgewater Correctional complex in Bridgewater, Massachusetts. Prior to 1995, the Boot Camp was listed as a DOC minimum security facility. In August, 1995, 128 beds were designated to security level 4 (state inmates) and 128 beds for county inmates. In October, 1995, these beds were added to security level 4 design capacity, and 128 beds were added to House of Correction tables.
- Norfolk County includes Braintree, Dedham, and Norfolk Contract. Middlesex County includes both Billerica and Cambridge. Berkshire County includes the Pre-Release facility. Essex County includes Middleton and Lawrence Correctional Alternative Center. Bristol County includes Dartmouth, Eastern Massachusetts Alternative Center, Ash Street and Pre-Release.
- Nashua Street inmates housed at other facilities are reported in the counts for the facilities in which they are in custody.
- During June, 1993, Plymouth House of Correction added 833 beds increasing its total to 1,140 beds.

- On April 18, 1995, new security level changes were established according to 103 DOC 101 Correctional Institutions/Custody Levels policy which states:

Custody Levels:

- **Level One.** The least restrictive in the department and is reserved only for those inmates who are at the end of their sentence and have been identified as posing little to no threat to the community. Supervision is minimal and indirect.

- **Level Two.** A custody level in which both design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the goal of restoring to the inmate maximum responsibility and control of their own behavior and actions prior to their release. Direct supervision of these inmates is not required, but intermittent observation may be appropriate under certain conditions. Inmates within this level may be permitted to access the community unescorted to participate in programming to include, but not limited to, work release, educational release, etc.

- **Level Three.** A custody level in which both the design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the goal of returning to the inmate a greater sense of personal responsibility and autonomy while still providing for supervision and monitoring of behavior and activity. Inmates within this security level are not considered a serious risk to the safety of staff, inmates or to the public. Program participation is mandated and geared toward their potential reintegration into the community. Access to the community is limited and under constant direct staff supervision.

- **Level Four.** A custody level in which both the design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the goal of restoring to the inmate some degree of responsibility and control of their own behavior and actions, while still insuring the safety of staff and inmates. Design/construction is generally characterized by high security parameters and limited use of internal physical barriers. Inmates at this level have demonstrated the ability to abide by rules and regulations and require intermittent supervision. However, behavior in the community, i.e., criminal sentence and/or the presence of serious outstanding legal matters indicate the need for some control and for segregation from the community. Job and program opportunities exist for all inmates within the perimeter of the facility.

- **Level Five.** A custody level in which design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the need to provide maximum external and internal control and supervision of inmates. Inmates accorded to this status may present an escape risk or pose a threat to other inmates, staff, or the orderly running of the institution, however, at a lesser degree than those at level 6. Supervision remains constant and direct. Through an inmates willingness to comply with institutional rules and regulations, increased job and program opportunities exist.

- **Level Six.** A custody level in which both design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the need to provide maximum external and internal control and supervision of inmates primarily through the use of high security parameters and extensive use of internal physical barriers and check points. Inmates accorded this status present serious escape risks or pose serious threats to themselves, to other inmates, to staff, or the orderly running of the institution. Supervision of inmates is direct and constant. Inmates are confined to their cells at all times, except when they are removed for authorized activities. Inmates within their status, when removed from their cell, are typically under escort and in restraints.

Abbreviations

AC	- Addiction Center	OSCC	- Old Colony Correctional Center
ADP	- Average Daily Population	OUI	- Operating Under the Influence
ATU	- Awaiting Trial Unit	PPREP	- Pre-Parole Residential Environmental Phase Program
CRS	- Contract Residential Services Includes Charlotte House, and Houston House	PRC	- Pre-Release Center
DDU	- Departmental Disciplinary Unit	SECC	- Southeastern Correctional Ctr.
DOC	- Department of Correction	SDPTC	- Sexually Dangerous Person Treatment Center
DSU	- Departmental Segregation Unit	SMCC	- South Middlesex Correctional Center (formerly SMPRC)
HOC	- House of Correction	SH	- State Hospital
NECC	- Northeastern Correctional Center	TC	- Treatment Center (Longwood, Bridgewater)
NCCI	- North Central Correctional Institution at Gardner		

Table 1 provides the DOC figures for the first quarter of 1998. As this table indicates, the DOC population (excluding Bridgewater SH, SDPTC, AC, Longwood TC, and county inmates at the Mass. Boot Camp) increased by 122 inmates during the first quarter. At the end of the quarter, the DOC operated with 10,136 inmates in the system, and the average daily population was 10,070 with a design capacity of 7,106. Thus, the DOC operated at 142 percent of design capacity.

Population in DOC Facilities, January 2, 1998 to March 31, 1998					
Custody Level/ Facility	Avg Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacit y
Custody Level 6					
Cedar Junction	815	813	793	633	129%
Framingham - ATU	98	102	102	64	153%
Custody Level 5					
OCCC	698	700	703	488	143%
Custody Level 4					
Concord	1,318	1,298	1,373	614	215%
Framingham	507	494	488	388	131%
Norfolk	1,518	1,514	1,514	1,084	140%
Bay State	296	294	296	266	111%
NCCI	934	928	934	568	164%
SECC	805	809	804	456	176%
Shirley-Medium	1,096	1,102	1,099	720	152%
Mass. Boot Camp	105	110	114	128	82%
*Bridgewater TC	344	335	346	345	100%
Sub-Total	8,534	8,499	8,566	5,754	148%
Custody Level 3					
Plymouth	174	171	181	151	115%
NECC	212	206	215	150	141%
SECC-Minimum	90	88	92	100	90%
Shirley-Lower	309	292	333	403	77%
Pondville	179	181	171	100	179%
Custody Level 3/2					
Lancaster-Male	121	116	124	94	129%
Lancaster-Female	53	52	56	59	90%
SMCC	196	196	195	125	156%
Sub-Total	1,334	1,302	1,367	1,182	113%
Custody Level 2					
Boston State	93	98	93	55	169%
Park Drive	49	48	50	50	99%
Hodder House	29	33	27	35	82%
Custody Level 1					
Charlotte	9	8	11	15	62%
Houston House	13	13	11	15	84%
PPREP	9	13	11	n.a.	n.a
Sub-Total	202	213	203	170	119%
Total	10,070	10,014	10,136	7,106	142%
Bridgewater SH	361	367	357	227	159%
Bridgewater TC	187	189	186	216	87%
Bridgewater AC	96	103	94	214	45%
Longwood TC	135	135	130	125	108%
Sub-Total	779	794	767	782	100%
Grand Total	10,849	10,808	10,903	7,888	138%
Houses of Correction	725	738	715	n.a	n.a
Federal Prisons	27	27	26	n.a	n.a
Inter-State Contract	376	376	363	n.a	n.a

(* See Technical Notes)

Table 2 provides the DOC figures for the previous twelve months - i.e., for the period January 2, 1997 to December 31, 1997. These figures indicate that the DOC population increased by 107, or 1 percent, over this twelve month period (excluding Bridgewater SH, SDPTC, AC, Longwood TC, and county inmates at the Mass. Boot Camp), from 9,926 in January, 1997 to 10,033 in December, 1997.

Population in DOC Facilities, January 2, 1997 to December 31, 1997					
Custody Level/ Facility	Avg Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
Custody Level 6					
Cedar Junction	812	818	812	633	128%
Framingham - ATU	103	114	102	64	161%
Custody Level 5					
OSCC	698	700	701	488	143%
Custody Level 4					
Concord	1,262	1,182	1,304	614	206%
Framingham	499	473	495	388	129%
Norfolk	1,518	1,518	1,518	1,084	140%
Bay State	294	295	293	266	111%
NCCI	972	1,013	930	568	171%
SECC	819	846	809	456	180%
Shirley-Medium	1,094	1,101	1,097	720	152%
Mass. Boot Camp	97	108	109	128	76%
*Bridgewater TC	236	50	341	345	68%
Sub-Total	8,404	8,218	8,511	5,754	146%
Custody Level 3					
Plymouth	184	189	171	151	122%
NECC	238	250	208	150	159%
SECC-Minimum	98	103	88	100	98%
Shirley-Lower	339	342	293	403	84%
Pondville	188	189	181	100	188%
Custody Level 3/2					
Lancaster-Male	129	201	118	94	137%
Lancaster-Female	54	65	52	59	92%
SMCC	193	167	198	125	154%
Sub-Total	1,423	1,506	1,309	1,182	120%
Custody Level 2					
Boston State	94	90	98	55	171%
Park Drive	48	50	48	50	96%
Hodder House	32	30	33	35	91%
Custody Level 1					
Charlotte	9	8	8	15	60%
Houston House	10	11	13	15	67%
PPREP	11	13	13	n.a.	n.a.
Sub-Total	204	202	213	170	120%
Total	10,031	9,926	10,033	7,106	141%
Bridgewater SH	368	357	359	227	162%
Bridgewater TC	194	188	189	216	90%
Bridgewater AC	112	121	108	214	52%
Longwood TC	144	141	136	125	115%
Sub-Total	818	807	792	782	105%
Grand Total	10,849	10,733	10,825	7,888	138%
Houses of Correction	725	772	738	n.a.	n.a.
Federal Prisons	27	30	27	n.a.	n.a.
Inter-State Contract	366	316	376	n.a.	n.a.

(* See Technical Notes)


Table 3 presents the county figures for the first quarter of 1998. The county population increased by 549 inmates, or 5 percent during this quarter. At the end of the quarter, the county system operated with 12,564 inmates, and the average daily population was 12,476 in facilities with a total design capacity of 8,356. Thus, the county system operated at 149 percent of design capacity.

Population in County Correctional Facilities, January 2, 1998 to March 31, 1998					
Facility	Avg Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
Barnstable	263	255	242	110	239%
Berkshire	241	243	222	116	208%
Bristol	1,240	1,251	1,221	666	186%
Dukes	21	20	19	19	111%
Essex	1,374	1,344	1,388	635	216%
Franklin	147	139	148	63	233%
Hampden	1,683	1,593	1,675	1,178	143%
Hampden-OUI	139	143	138	125	111%
Hampshire	245	243	246	248	99%
Middlesex	1,399	1,371	1,412	1,035	135%
Norfolk	599	572	637	379	158%
Plymouth	1,156	1,098	1,162	1,140	101%
Suffolk-Nashua St	684	605	722	453	151%
Suffolk-So. Bay	1,813	1,753	1,854	1,146	158%
Worcester	1,262	1,184	1,291	790	160%
Longwood TC	136	135	130	125	109%
Mass. Boot Camp	74	66	57	128	58%
Total	12,476	12,015	12,564	8,356	149%

Table 4 presents the county figures for the previous twelve months. These figures indicate that the county population increased by 183 inmates or 2 percent over this twelve-month period, from 11,944 in January 1997, to 12,121 in December, 1997.


Population in County Correctional Facilities, January 2, 1997 to December 31, 1997					
Facility	Avg Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
Barnstable	286	296	266	110	260%
Berkshire	252	244	246	116	217%
Bristol	1,317	1,183	1,267	666	198%
Dukes	19	23	19	19	100%
Essex	1,367	1,363	1,353	635	215%
Franklin	134	125	141	63	213%
Hampden	1,616	1,531	1,603	1,178	137%
Hampden-OUI	140	132	137	125	112%
Hampshire	262	265	245	248	106%
Middlesex	1,347	1,262	1,370	1,035	130%
Norfolk	614	602	568	379	162%
Plymouth	1,216	1,173	1,095	1,140	107%
Suffolk-Nashua St	650	584	621	453	143%
Suffolk- So.Bay	1,812	1,818	1,785	1,146	158%
Worcester	1,220	1,154	1,203	790	154%
Longwood TC	144	141	136	125	115%
Mass. Boot Camp	64	48	66	128	50%
Total	12,460	11,944	12,121	8,356	149%

Figure 1.
DOC Sentenced Population, First Quarter of 1997 and 1998



The graph above compares the DOC sentenced population in 1997 to that in 1998. For January, 1998 the DOC population increased by 27 inmates compared with the same month of 1997; for February, the population increased by 48 inmates; and for March, the population increased by 103 inmates or 1 percent.

Figure 2.
HOC Population, First Quarter of 1997 and 1998



The graph above compares the HOC population in 1997 to that in 1998. For January, 1998 the HOC population increased by 156 inmates (1%) compared with the same month of 1997; for February, the population increased by 30 inmates; and for March, the population increased by 211 inmates or 2 percent.

Note: Data from figures 1 and 2 were taken from the end of the month daily count sheet compiled by the Classification Division.

Table 5 provides statistics on court commitments by gender to the DOC in 1997 and 1998. Overall, there has been a decrease of 41 commitments, or minus 5 percent for 1998 in comparison with the number of commitments in 1997 from 796 to 755. Male commitments for 1998 decreased by 28, or minus 5 percent from 1997. Female commitments during 1998 decreased by 13, or minus 5 percent compared to the number of commitments during the same period in 1997.

DOC Court Commitments by Gender			
	1997	1998	Difference
Males			
First Quarter	545	517	-5%
Females			
First Quarter	251	238	-5%
Total	796	755	-5%

Figure 3 provides a graphical representation of the number of court commitments by gender to the DOC during the first quarter of 1997 and the first quarter of 1998.

